

REMARKS

We have added the missing status identifiers to claims 12 to 28. This paper supersedes the reply to the office action filed on December 15, 2004.

We have cancelled claims 12-28 without prejudice and may pursue these claims in a continuation application. We have addressed the Examiner's provisional double patenting by amending dependent claims 7 and 9 to depend from claims 1 and 8, respectively. We have also addressed the Examiner § 112, second paragraph rejections by amending independent claim 1 to recite that the at least one support member is configured to be mechanically coupled to the portion of the rotor assembly and to opposing portions of the inner radial surface of the at least one superconducting winding.

Prior Art Rejections

Independent Claim 1

The Examiner rejected claim 1 as anticipated by Laskaris. The Examiner also rejected claims 1-4, 7-8 and 11 as being anticipated by Kameoka. We submit, however, that neither Laskaris nor Kameoka describe or suggest a superconducting coil assembly including a superconducting winding being spaced from and in radial relation to the axis of the rotor assembly, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Rather, Laskaris discloses a coil that is disposed in the same plane as its rotation axis. As shown in Fig. 1, a superconducting winding 34 lies in the same plane and rotates about longitudinally extending axis 20. Similarly, Kameoka describes a superconducting winding that rotates about the axis located in the same plane in which it lies. For example, as described in column 5 lines 51-54 and shown in Fig. 2, the winding rotates around Y-axis.

For these reasons, we submit that independent claim 1 is patentable over the Laskaris and Kameoka patents. We further submit that because claims 2-4, 7-8 and 11 depend from claim 1, these dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable.

Applicant : Gregory L. Snitchler et al.
Serial No. : 10/085,471
Filed : February 28, 2002
Page : 6 of 6

Attorney's Docket No.: 05770-114001 / AMSC-474

Dependent claims 5-6 and 9-10

The Examiner also rejected claims 5-6, and 9-10 as being unpatentable over Kameoka in view of Maeda (U.S. 5,387,889). However, Maeda adds nothing to the feature found to be missing from Kameoka. In particular, Maeda says nothing about a winding being spaced from and in radial relation to the axis of the rotor assembly. Consequently, neither Kameoka nor Maeda, separate or combined suggest the claimed invention.

We submit therefore that claims 5-6 and 9-10 are patentable over the Kameoka in view of Maeda.


Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket Number 05770-114001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 31, 2005

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21058779.doc



Frank R. Occhiuti
Reg. No. 35,306